

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-13 stand rejected. Claims 14-27 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 8 and 9 are amended. No new matter is added. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated June 24, 2008.

**Specification:**

Applicants have amended the specification to correct a typographical error.

**Drawings**

The drawings were objected to because in Figs. 9-13, according to the Examiner, dark shading is not permitted. Applicants note that FIGS. 9-13 are scanning electron microscope (SEM) images. According to 37 C.F.R. § 1.84, "Photographs, including photocopies of photographs, are not ordinarily permitted in utility and design patent applications. The Office will accept photographs in utility and design patent applications, however, if photographs are the only practicable medium for illustrating the claimed invention."

Thus, because the FIGS. are images taken from an SEM, a photograph is the only practicable medium for illustrating the claimed invention. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection be withdrawn.

## On the Merits

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Gold* (US Patent Application 2004/0237987). Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed features of application are not disclosed or fairly suggested by the cited references.

### Independent Claim 1:

Independent claim 1 now requires:

A double-stick adhesive tape for a wig, which has a net member as a portion of a wig base, comprising:

two adhesive surface layers, wherein  
at least one surface of the two adhesive surface layers is deglossed.

Applicants have amended claim 1 as shown above. Claim 1 requires “**two adhesive layers**” of a double-stick adhesive tape. Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is not disclosed or fairly suggested by the cited references. Specifically, *Gold* and *Elliot*, only appear to disclose using “an” [singular] adhesive layer, and do not disclose using “**two adhesive layers**” of a double-stick adhesive tape as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 also recites a “wig base.” Applicants respectfully submit that if the Examiner considers reference character 1 of *Gold* (laminar support) to be a double-stick adhesive tape, then *Gold* cannot also disclose a “wig base” as recited by claim 1. That is, neither *Gold* nor

*Elliot* disclose a *double-stick adhesive tape* which has a *net member* as a portion of a *wig base*.  
(Emphasis added.)

Furthermore, regarding the feature of the “adhesive surface layers is deglossed,” the Examiner contends it is disclosed in *Gold* in FIG. 8B and paragraph [0032]. FIG. 8B is a section view of a sticker. Paragraph [0029]. Paragraph [0032] describes FIGS. 1A and 1B. Applicants respectfully submit that *Gold* does not disclose at least one surface of both adhesive surface layers is deglossed. No mention is made of this feature in the cited passages.

Dependent Claim 2:

As claim 2 depends from claim 1, the arguments presented above regarding claim 1 also apply to claim 2.

Dependent Claims 3-6:

As claims 3-6 ultimately depend from claim 1, the arguments presented above regarding claim 1 also apply to its dependent claims.

Claims 7, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gold*.

Dependent Claims 7, 12 and 13:

Regarding claim 7, the Examiner contends that “the surface roughness of minute concavity and convexity of said adhesive layer is made larger than light wavelength,” is obvious because once the general conditions of a claim are disclosed, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. Applicants submit that the recited feature is not obvious.

Applicants note that in paragraph [0014] of the present specification it states that the reason for this is:

when one side of the adhesive surface of double-stick adhesive tape for wig bonding is bonded to the backside of a wig, the light incoming from the outside of the wig on to the adhesive surface of the double-stick adhesive tape reflects diffusely, thereby unnatural light is not generated.

Thus, the features of claim 7 are arrived at for a specific and non-obvious reason.

Claims 8-11, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Elliot* (US Patent 6,016,814) in view of *Gold*.

Independent Claim 8:

Independent claim 8 now requires:

A double-stick adhesive tape for a wig which has a net member as a portion of a wig base, comprising:

two adhesive layers of a double-stick adhesive tape, wherein  
a first side of the adhesive layers is formed to have a thickness to bury  
more than half of a wire diameter of said net member.

As indicated above regarding independent claim 1, the recited feature of “two adhesive layers” is a novel feature that is not disclosed or fairly suggested by the references. That is, neither *Gold* nor *Elliot* disclose “two” adhesive layers of a double-stick tape, as recited by claim 8.

Additionally, as mentioned above regarding claim 1, the references also do not disclose a “wig base” as recited in claim 8.

Independent Claim 9:

Independent Claim 9 requires:

A double-stick adhesive tape for a wig which has a net member as a portion of a wig base, comprising:

two adhesive layers of a double-stick adhesive tape, wherein a first side of the adhesive layers is formed to have a thickness to bury more than half of a wire diameter of said net member, and a second side of said adhesive layers is deglossed.

As indicated earlier with claims 1 and 8, the recited feature of “two adhesive layers” of a double-stick tape is not disclosed or fairly suggested by either *Gold* or *Elliot*.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is allowable and ask that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Application No.: 10/544,573  
Art Unit: 3732


Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Attorney Docket No.: 052875

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Dennis M. Hubbs

Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 59,145  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DMH/nrp